F-5

IIHR FLUME STUDY

COMMENTS RE: SCOPE OF WORK (MAYNORD)

Andy and MM Review Team: 10 March 1999

I am working on reviewing the SOW developed by Andy and trying to decide what to presen a: the field review group meeting next week and am trying to resolve some differences between what can be funded under the research investigation and the proposed effort outlined by And' . One of the differences is that the SOW we developed for the research investigation has five t sk: and a decision point about future studies whereas Andy's SOW outlines a broader effort. Consequently, the time required for the what is outlined in the research SOW is significantly es: than in Andy's SOW. Part of the reason for this is Andy's time line is constrained by the requirements to obtain a degree whereas the research investigation does not have this constra nt. The SOW we developed for R&D funding up to the decision point is as follows:

1. Familiarization with MM using Richardson- same as Andy SOW
2. Utilize outside experts to assist in developing evaluation plan- recently agreed to
3. Compare model/prototype from about15 previous movable bed model studies- same as An ly SOW
4. Conduct MM at traditional scale of one prototype reach (Kate Aubrey) having data before changes, changes, and data after the river has responded to changes- same as Andy SOW
5. Use Kate Aubrey MM to conduct repeatability, sensitivity studies- similar to Andy SOW

As you can see most steps are identical to what is proposed in Andy's SOW. For the researcl investigation, completion of these 5 steps meant that we had arrived at a decision point. At th is point we would have to answer the following questions:
1. Do we have enough information to conclude evaluation?
2. Do we need one or more additional reaches like Kate Aubrey where we can compare the before change, change, and after change conditions?
3. Do we need to conduct MM at twice or 4 times the traditional MM size?

As you can see, questions 2 and 3 are addressed in Andy's SOW. I prefer the decision point approach because there are so many unknowns in this type of effort. For example, why conduct a MM twice or 4 times as large if our evaluation shows the traditional size is satisfactory?

The research SOW time line proposed completion of the first 5 steps by this time next year, March-April of 2000. At that time we would present our findings to the Field Review Group and propose additional work if needed.

From the standpoint of requesting funding for Headquarters funded R&D, I believe we should recommend this decision point approach to the field review group as opposed to requesting the longer term funding.

Let me have your comments.

Steve